

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Final Office Action, claims 1-35 were rejected. Claims 1, 7, 15, 17, 25-29, 34 and 35 have been amended. New claim 36 has been added. Thus, claims 1-36 are pending and under consideration. No new matter has been added. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,794,207 (Walker et al.).

Walker et al. discloses a commercial network system which individual buyers use to issue a conditional purchase offer (CPO) to potential sellers and a seller, who meets the terms of the CPO, uses to bind the buyer to form a legally binding contract. According to Walker et al., a buyer creates a CPO, which is made available to potential buyers by assigning the CPO a unique tracking number and posting the CPO (see, col. 15, lines 45-52). Seller responses are then transmitted to a central controller that contacts the buyer to indicate that the CPO has been bound (see, col. 15, lines 56-59), and changes the status of the CPO to “completed” to prevent subsequent sellers from being able to bind the CPO (see, col. 19, line 66 through col. 20, line 4). This means that Walker et al. relates to processing sales events of a CPO between a buyer and a seller who meets the terms of the CPO. For example, a potential seller meeting terms of more than one CPO created by a buyer is required to individually process the CPOs.

In contrast, as recited in amended independent claims 1, 7, 17, 25-29 and 35, the present invention includes creating or making a “confirmation”, “notarization”, or “confirmatory” document for “a selected portion of sales data of at least one item from a corresponding seller record” (“a corresponding voucher” in claim 35). Further, amended independent claim 15 recites that a seller creates a notarization document for “a selected portion of the sales data of at least one item from a corresponding buyer record”. This enables the present invention to efficiently verify records of the buyer and seller in response to the created document without the need to individually verify each transaction. Furthermore, independent claims 30 and 34 respectively recite that the present invention includes making a detailed payment statement of a payment object, “the payment object corresponding to selected items sold by the seller” and “aggregates a selected plurality of payment objects” for comparing the detailed payment statement with the seller sales record.

Walker et al. does not teach or suggest, creating a document for “a selected portion of the seller [or buyer] records” corresponding to sales records in relation to at least one item sold. Instead, Walker et al. discloses processing sales events of a single CPO in an aggregated manner.

Therefore, it is submitted that independent claims 1, 7, 15, 17, 25-29, 34 and 35 are patentable over Walker et al.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from independent claims 1, 7, 15, 17, 25-29, 34 and 35 are also patentably distinguishable over Walker et al. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 5, when “contents do not agree, as determined according to said confirmation means, said witness is notified of the substantive disagreement”. The Walker et al. method does not teach or suggest allowing “a selected portion” of seller records to be sent to be confirmed or verified with content of seller records by the seller (claim 1 upon which claim 5 depends), where when “contents do not agree, as determined according to said confirmation means, said witness is notified of the substantive disagreement” (claim 5).

For the above reasons, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 36 is added to include, “transmitting a confirmation document to the witness system from a buyer in response to receipt of seller records corresponding to sold items delivered by a seller, the confirmation document including a selected portion of the seller records received by the buyer” and “automatically determining delivery vouchers of the seller corresponding to the selected portion of the seller records included in the confirmation document” for “authenticating the confirmation document with the delivery vouchers of the seller” via the witness system. This provides an efficient accounting operation, especially in cases where a single payment is made for a various transactions.

It is respectfully submitted that new claim 36 is patentably distinguishable over Walker et al.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT:

It is respectfully submitted that the Amendment to claims 1, 7, 15, 17, 25-29, 34 and 35 and the addition of new claim 36, although clarifying the present invention, does not raise any new issues requiring a further search. Therefore, entry of the Amendment and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2/22/05

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501